REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 14-15, 17, 20-21 and 25-31 are pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Interview Summary: This paragraph summarizes the telephone interview of October 3, 2007 between Examiner Melody M. Burch and Sean D. Burdick (attorney for Applicant). The interview focused on the "cavity" element of Claim 1 and whether the *Burroughs* reference teaches this element. The Examiner and attorney agreed that if the cavity element were amended to recite: "*a cavity having a bottom surface extending across the inner diameter of the body forming an outer surface of the top end, and having an opening opposite the bottom surface for receiving an electronic component*", then Claim 1 would be allowable over *Burroughs*.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite: *a cavity having a perimeter and a bottom surface extending diametrically within the perimeter and forming an outer surface of the top end, and having an opening opposite the bottom surface for receiving an electronic component.* Applicant believes this language is equivalent to the language agreed upon during the interview, but is preferable because it recites proper antecedent basis. Claims 10, 15 and 21 have been similarly amended.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 14-15, 17, 20-21 and 25-31 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 3,330,520 ("*Burroughs*") in view of U.S. Patent 5,110,660 ("*Wolf*"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Burroughs teaches a rigid metal ring with elastic inserts for use as a suspension system for a sensitive inertial guidance system. *Wolf* teaches a perforated rubber spring for suspending great masses. Well-established patent law holds that a rejection based on 35 USC § 103 cannot be sustained unless the cited reference(s) (a) provide a suggestion or motivation to combine reference teachings; (b) provide a reasonable expectation of success;

and (c) teach all of the claim limitations. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The teachings of *Burroughs* considered alone or in combination with the teachings of *Wolf* are insufficient basis for an obviousness rejection because, *inter alia*, these references fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of any claim.

Claim 1 recites "*a body ... made of an elastomeric material.*" The Office Action in part 3 credits *Burroughs* with teaching this limitation, however, *Burroughs* does not teach this limitation because the body of the *Burroughs* gimbal structure 10 is a "rigid material such as cast magnesium." *Burroughs* at col. 2, lines 15-17. Applicant requests that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 1 is directed to a multi-axis shock and vibration isolator, and recites structure for "*attenuating a vibration at a first frequency along a vertical axis*" and for "*attenuating vibration at a second frequency along a lateral axis that is perpendicular to the vertical axis.*" The Office Action in part 3 credits *Burroughs* with teaching these limitations, however, *Burroughs* does not teach these limitations. *Burroughs* teaches a single-axis damping ring. *Burroughs* at col. 1, lines 60-72 (teaching a single directionalized damping ring that would require a "plurality of rings" to ensure damping along three axes); *Burroughs* at col. 2, lines 70-72 ("slots 26 are primarily effective to damp vibrational disturbances which are directed along the azimuth axis"). Applicant requests that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 1 recites "*first and second holes being sized and shaped for attenuating vibration at a second frequency.*" The Office Action in part 3 credits *Burroughs* with teaching this limitation, however, *Burroughs* does not teach this limitation. *Burroughs* teaches trunnion holes 14, 16, 20, and 22 formed in rigid magnesium metal. *Burroughs* at col. 2, lines 15-17. Due to the rigidity of the ring material, trunnion holes 14, 16, 20, and 22 cannot contribute to the attenuation of vibration at any frequency along any axis. Applicant requests that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "*a cavity having a perimeter and a bottom surface extending diametrically within the perimeter and forming an outer surface of the top end.*" *Burroughs* does not teach this limitation. The Office Action states that the *Burroughs* "cavity" is "the inside of the device extending from the upper surface shown below the lead line of number 12 in FIG. 5" to a "bottom surface" which is "the top of the first surface 26 shown in FIG. 5 and enlarged in FIG. 3 forming an outer surface of the top end."

While the hollow interior of the *Burroughs* device may define a "cavity," there is no bottom surface of that cavity opposite an opening, as claimed. Although a visco elastic finger 26 shown in FIG. 3 of *Burroughs* may have a surface, that surface is not located opposite the opening of the cavity.

To more clearly differentiate the present invention from *Burroughs*, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite that the bottom surface extends diametrically within the perimeter of the cavity. Applicant requests that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

In all claim rejections, *Wolf* is cited only for teaching the use of an elastomer in place of the visco elastic material taught by *Burroughs*. Office Action, page 3. The visco elastic material in *Burroughs* is used only to form narrow strips of cured elastic that penetrate slots 26. Burroughs at col. 2, lines 51-57; col. 2, line 70 to col. 3, line 5; FIG. 3. The replacement of *Burrough's* narrow elastic strips with *Wolf's* elastomer provides no additional structure to teach or suggest elements of Claim 1 that are not taught by *Burroughs* alone. In other words, the obviousness rejections based on a combination of *Wolf* and *Burroughs* should be withdrawn for the all the same reasons presented above.

Based on all of the above, Applicant requests that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn. Claims 2-6, 8 and 25-31 depend from Claim 1. Applicant requests the rejection of these claims be withdrawn based on dependency.

Claim 10 contains "*body*", "*cavity*", and "*vibration attenuation*" elements similar to those recited in Claim 1, and has been amended to recite a bottom surface extending diametrically within the perimeter of the cavity. Claim 10 should therefore be allowed over *Burroughs* and *Wolf* for the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable. Claim 14 depends from Claim 10. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 10, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 14 based on dependency.

Claims 15 and 21 each contain "*body*" and "*cavity*" elements similar to those recited in Claim 1, and have each been amended to recite a bottom surface extending diametrically within the perimeter of the cavity. Claims 15 and 21 should be allowed over *Burroughs* and *Wolf* for the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 17 and 20 depend from Claim 15. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 15 and 21, and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 17 and 20 based on dependency.

With further regard to Claims 25-31, each recites an isolator having a body that absorbs shock by resilient collapse. *Burroughs* teaches a rigid metal body that is incapable of absorbing shock by resilient collapse. *Burroughs* at col. 2, lines 15-17. Since *Wolf* is cited only for replacing *Burrough's* visco elastic strips with *Wolf's* elastomer material, *Burroughs* in view of *Wolf* does not teach the resilient collapse limitation of any of these claims. Applicant requests that the rejections of Claims 25-31 be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Very truly yours,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

Sean D. Burdick
Registration No. 51,513
600 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Telephone: (714) 427-7083
Facsimile: (714) 427-7799